

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|---|----------------------|----------------------|-------------------------|------------------|
| 10/691,583 | 10/24/2003 | Kazuhito Yanadori | OGW-0317 | 9481 |
| 23353 7590 02/07/2007 RADER FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC LION BUILDING 1233 20TH STREET N.W., SUITE 501 WASHINGTON, DC 20036 | | | EXAMINER | |
| | | | BRUENJES, CHRISTOPHER P | |
| | | | ART UNIT | PAPER NUMBER |
| • | | | 1772 | |
| | | | | |
| SHORTENED STATUTOR | Y PERIOD OF RESPONSE | MAIL DATE | DELIVERY MODE | |
| 2 MONTHS | | 02/07/2007 | PAPER | |

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Page 2

Application/Control Number: 10/691,583

Art Unit: 1772

SUPPLEMENTAL EXAMINER'S ANSWER

Responsive to the reply brief filed under 37 CFR 41.41 filed on December 13, 2006, a supplemental Examiner's Answer is set forth below:

This supplemental examiner's answer is to correct the typing error in the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 5 and 7 in which "Inada" was inadvertently typed when the intention was "Kuribayashi". Therefore, the following rejection should be substituted for the 35 U.S.C. 103 rejections of claims 5 and 7 presented in the Examiner's Answer to clarify that the rejection only includes the teachings of Randle, Ikeda, and Kuribayashi as specified in the rejection.

Claims 5 and 7 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Randle et al in view of Ikeda et al as applied to claims 1-3 above, and further in view of Kuribayashi et al (USPN 5,371,153).

Randle et al and Ikeda et al taken as a whole teach all that is claimed in claims 1-3 and teach that the reinforcing layers are formed by braids of the twisted cords (col.2, 1.58-60 of Randle et al). Randle et al and Ikeda et al fail to teach that the twisted cords have a double-twist structure. However,

Application/Control Number: 10/691,583

Art Unit: 1772

Kuribayashi et al teach reinforcing fiber layers for rubber hose reinforcement formed of twisted organic fibers (col.1, 1.8-13 and col.2, 1.46-50) and teaches that these twisted organic fibers are formed into double-twist structures (col.5, 1.1-3) in which a plurality of primary twisted cords are twisted together with final twists in a same twist direction of the primary twisted cords. One of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the references are analogous insofar as all three references are concerned with fiber reinforcement layers used in the formation of rubber hoses.

Page 3

Therefore it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time Applicant's invention was made to select a double-twist structure as the twisted cords of Randle et al and Ikeda et al depending on the intended end result of the hose since double-twist structures are used as twisted cords in formation of braided reinforcement layers for rubber hoses, as taught by Kuribayashi et al.

Application/Control Number: 10/691,583 Page 4

Art Unit: 1772

Appellant may file another reply brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.41 within two months of the date of mailing of this supplemental examiner's answer. Extensions of time under 37 CFR 1.136(a) are not applicable to this two month time period. 37 CFR 41.43(b)-(c).

Respectfully submitted,

Christopher P Bruenjes Art Unit 1772

CPB

October 7, 2006

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER **TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700**

A Technology Center Director or designee has approved this supplemental examiner's answer by signing below:

QUAL: ASSURANCE SPECIALIST